

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/539,406	11/23/2005	Christelle Pragnon	021305-00214	2881
4372 7550 06/19/2008 ARENT FOX LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.			EXAMINER	
			MARTIN, PAUL C	
SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	,		1657	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/19/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com IPMatters@arentfox.com Patent Mail@arentfox.com



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONTROL NO. PATENT IN REEXAMINATION

10/539,406

EXAMINER

ART UNIT PAPER
1657 20080610

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Contunued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

Receipt is acknowledged of a request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) and a submission, filed on 01/08/08. The submission, however, is not fully responsive to the prior Office action because the Remarks and Amendments do not address the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph rejection of Claims 6-13 as failing to comply with the written description requirement with regard to New Matter or the rejection of Claims 8-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the Applicant regards as the invention, specially that Claims 8-10 are drawn to the application of the method of any one of claims 1-3 and 5-6 to the evaluation of the invasive character of the cells weak to the concepnicity of the cells and prediction of the sensitivity of the cells and anticancer treatment respectively. It is unclear how these goals will be accomplished, as there are no further method steps or description for making these determinations. Since the Advisory Action of 12/407 realfirmed those rejections and answered the Applicant's arguments, the current amendment which does not further address those rejections or amend the claims is deemed to be non-responsive. Since the unbinsision does not appear to be a bona fide attempt to provide a complete reply to the prior Office action, the statutory period is from the mailing date of the original Non-responsive letter of 03/14/408, to submit a complete reply.

Paul Martin Examiner Art Unit 1657 06/11/08

/Jon P Weber/, SPE 1657